REMARKS

In the Office Action, claims 1-3, 7-19, 21 and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by VanBuskirk et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,075,534, hereinafter VanBuskirk). Claims 4-6, 20, 22-28, and 30-33 were rejected as being obvious from VanBuskirk in view of French-St.George et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,018,711, hereinafter French-St. George).

VanBuskirk describes a volume tracking window for a speech recognition system. Under VanBuskirk, the current detected volume of a speech signal is represented in the window by changing the color of the entire window or by moving a colored bar horizontally to show the current volume. The volume tracking window in VanBuskirk may be a "floating window". However, VanBuskirk does not show or suggest that the volume tracking window should be placed near an insertion marker. In addition, VanBuskirk does not show or suggest a progress meter that shows the progress of decoding an input speech segment.

French-St. George discloses an animation that indicates the amount of time the user has left in which to provide speech input to a speech recognizer. French-St. George does not suggest that this animation should be placed near an insertion point and does not show or suggest a progress meter that indicates the progress of decoding an input speech segment.

Claims 1-20

Independent claim 1 of the present application is directed toward a method of displaying images on a display device. The method includes displaying an insertion marker at an insertion area on a display and displaying a meter near the insertion area based on the location of the insertion marker. The meter indicates the state of the computer system relative to speech input.

In the Office Action, it was asserted that since VanBuskirk shows a volume tracking meter in a "floating window"

it discloses the placement of a meter near an insertion area. Applicants respectfully dispute this assertion.

In particular, Applicant's note that VanBuskirk does not say that its meter should be placed near an insertion area. Instead, it suggests that the meter should be placed outside of the main portion of the application window, such as in a tool menu, a title bar or the task bar. Thus, at most, VanBuskirk teaches that the floating window should be place in a location in which it will not obstruct the user's view of the main application window.

Since there is no teaching or suggestion in VanBuskirk that the floating volume meter should be placed near an insertion area, claim 1 and claims 2-16 which depend therefrom are patentably distinct from VanBuskirk.

Claim 1 is also patentably distinct from the combination of VanBuskirk and French-St.George. Like VanBuskirk, French-St.George does not indicate that a speech recognition meter should be placed near an insertion area based on the location of an insertion marker. Instead, French-St. George teaches that a window animation should be placed in a fixed area at the bottom of the display. This area does not change as the location of an insertion marker changes. As such, French-St. George does not show or suggest displaying a meter near an insertion area based on the location of an insertion marker.

Since the combination of VanBuskirk and French-St. George does not show or suggest placing a meter near an insertion area based on the location of an insertion marker, claims 1-16 are patentably distinct from the cited combination.

Claims 4-12

Claims 4-12 are additionally patentable over the combination of VanBuskirk and French-St. George. Claim 4 includes a limitation to applying a mathematical function to a

digital speech value to produce a transform value. This limitation is not shown in VanBuskirk or French-St. George.

In the Office Action, it was asserted that because French-St. George shows an animation that appears as a non-linear function of time, it would be obvious to display the volume animation in VanBuskirk as a non-linear function of time. Applicants respectfully dispute this assertion.

The volume meter in VanBuskirk is designed to give the user real-time feedback as to the volume of the speech signal received by the system. This allows the user to modify their speech volume so that the system can hear their voice. Note that if the volume animation in VanBuskirk was non-linear with time, the feedback would not correlate with the user's speech signal, making it very difficult for the user to adjust their speech level. Thus, those skilled in the art would not apply the non-linear time animation of French-St. George to VanBuskirk.

In addition, neither French-St. George nor VanBuskirk teach that speech values should be transformed so that the range of the transform values is smaller than the range of the speech values. Neither cited reference provides any motivation for or suggests any benefit to performing such a transform. As such, the transform of claim 4 is patentably distinct from VanBuskirk and French-St. George making claims 4-12 additionally patentable over the cited references.

Claims 13-16

Claims 13-16 are also additionally patentable over the combination of VanBuskirk and French-St. George. Claim 13 depends from claim 1 and includes an additional limitation wherein the meter is a progress meter that indicates the progress of decoding speech into sub-word units.

Neither VanBuskirk nor French-St. George show or suggest a progress meter that indicates the progress in decoding a speech signal. VanBuskirk only shows a volume meter that

indicates the current volume of the speech signal being received and French-St. George only discloses an animation that indicates the amount of time left for the user to begin speaking.

As noted in the present application, the progress meter helps users to know that the recognition system is currently decoding the speech signal and has not become "frozen" or "hung-up". As such, the progress meter of claims 13-16 represent a significant advance over the meters shown in VanBuskirk and French-St. George.

Because none of the cited references show a progress meter, claims 13-16 are additionally patentable over the cited art.

Claims 17-20

Claim 17 is directed toward a computer program having at least one insertion point marker that indicates the location on the display where a user desires to provide input. The computer program also includes a meter generation routine that displays a meter near the insertion point based on the insertion point marker.

Like claim 1, claim 17 is not shown or suggested by VanBuskirk or the combination of VanBuskirk and French-St. George. In particular, neither VanBuskirk nor French-St.George show a computer program that displays a meter near an insertion point based on an insertion point marker.

As noted above, VanBuskirk does not indicate where its floating window should be placed and therefore does not teach that its location should be based on an insertion point marker. French-St. George teaches that its animation should be placed in a fixed position at the bottom of the screen.

Thus, since neither reference suggests that a meter should be placed in a location based on an insertion point marker, the combination of the two references does not show or suggest the invention of claim 17. As such, claim 17 and claims

18-20, which depend therefrom, are patentable over VanBuskirk and the combination of VanBuskirk and French-St. George.

Claims 21-28 and 29-33

Independent claims 21 and 29 are directed toward a method and a computer program, respectively, that display a volume meter and a progress meter in proximity to each other. The volume meter indicates the volume of a speech signal and the progress meter indicates the progress of a speech recognition system in decoding the speech signal.

As noted above, neither VanBuskirk nor French-St. George show or suggest a progress meter that indicates the progress in decoding a speech signal. As such, the combination of VanBuskirk and French-St. George cannot show a progress meter that is displayed near a volume meter and therefore cannot render claims 21-33 obvious.

Claims 24-28

Claims 24-28 are additionally patentable over the combination of VanBuskirk and French-St. George. Like claim 4, claim 24 includes limitations to transforming a digital value that represents a portion of a speech signal so that the range of the transformed values is less than the range of the digital values. As noted above for claim 4, neither VanBuskirk nor French-St. George suggests such a transform. Therefore, claims 24-28 are additionally patentable over the cited art.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above remarks, claims 1-33 are patentably distinct from the cited art. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-33 is respectfully requested.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: ____________________________________

Theodore M. Magee, Reg. No. 39,758
Suite 1600 - International Centre
900 Second Avenue South
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3319
Phone: (612) 334-3222 Fax: (612) 334-3312

tmm

MARKED-UP VERSION OF REPLACEMENT CLAIMS

1. (Amended) A method in a computer system for generating images on a display device, the method comprising:

displaying an insertion marker at an insertion area on a display, the insertion area representing the location at which the user desires to provide input; and

displaying a meter near the insertion area based on the location of the insertion marker, the meter indicative of a state of the computer system relative to speech input.